LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
SEP 4 1965
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1964

No. 537

REYNOLDS METALS COMPANY,
Appellant,
v.
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,
Appellees.

ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

DEWITT WILLIAMS
1440 Washington Building
Seattle, Washington 98101
Attorney for Appellant

JOSEPH V. HEFFRANAN
REYNOLDS METALS COMPANY
Reynolds Metals Building
Richmond, Virginia 23218

WILLIAMS, LANZA, KASTNER & GIBBS
1440 Washington Building
Seattle, Washington 98101
Of Counsel

METROPOLITAN PRESS SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

SUBJECT INDEX

	Page
Jurisdictional Statement	1
Jurisdiction	2
Questions Presented	3
Statutes and Constitutional Provisions	4
Statement of the Case	4
How the Federal Questions Were Raised in Proceedings Below	7
The Questions Are Substantial	8
First Question: "Is manufacturing a 'purely local activity' and hence not protected by the Fourteenth Amendment or the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution?"	8
A. Supreme Court of Washington	10
B. Supreme Court of the United States	11
Second Question: "Does the Fourteenth Amendment and the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution prohibit an additional tax burden imposed solely because an interstate business manufactures items in successive stages in several states rather than performing all manufacturing in one state?"	15
Third Question: "When the item has been produced partly without said State and thereafter partly within said State, is the effect of said unapportioned tax so measured to impose a tax upon activities outside the State and, therefore, is the tax repugnant to the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States?"	20-21
Fourth Question: "Is the Washington tax so seriously at variance with the taxing system of other states as to create substantial dangers of multiple burdens prohibited under the Commerce Clause?"	24

Page

Fifth Question:
"Is said Washington tax, which exempts from the tax on manufacturers those who pay the tax as sellers, repugnant to the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution and to the Fourteenth Amendment when applied to the production of an item in successive stages without and within said State for shipment outside the State, since it provides only a single tax on a combination of local manufacture and local sale while subjecting a combination of local manufacture and subsequent out-of-state further manufacture and/or sale to further taxation?" 27

Conclusion 32

Appendices:

Appendix A Opinion of the Supreme Court of the State of Washington.....App. 1

Appendix B Trial Court's Opinion (Superior Court of Thurston County, Washington) .....App. 10

Appendix C State Supreme Court's Final Judgment Entered April 19, 1965.....App. 16

Appendix D Statutes Chap. 82.04 of the Revised Code of Washington.....App. 18

Appendix E United States Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 8, Clause 3; Fourteenth Amendment .....App. 20

Appendix F Comparison of Cumulative Taxes On Interstate and Intrastate Business .....App. 21

TABLE OF CASES

Bowman v. Continental Oil Company, 256 U.S. 642..... 20

Columbia Steel Co. v. State of Washington, 30 Wn.2d 658, 192 P.2d 976; 39 Wn.2d 700, 209 P.2d 482..... 28

Crown Zellerbach Corp. v. State, 45 Wn.2d 749, 278 P.2d 305, 52 Wn.2d 813, 328 P.2d 884.....10-11, 28

Page

Dahnke-Walker Milling Company v. Bondurant, 257 U.S. 282 ..... 2, 8

Field Enterprises, Inc. v. State of Washington, 352 U.S. 806 ..... 2, 8

Fisher's Blend Station, Inc. v. Tax Commission, 297 U.S. 650 31

Freeman v. Hewit, 329 U.S. 249 32

General Motors Corp. v. Washington et al, 377 U.S. 436 18-19

General Motors Corp. v. District of Columbia, 380 U.S. 553 ..... 15, 24

Gwin, White & Prince, Inc. v. Henneford, et al., 305 U.S. 434 ..... 2, 8, 30, 31, 32

Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Co. v. Reily, 373 U.S. 64 ..... 15, 16, 22-23, 24

Hans Rees' Sons, Incorporated v. North Carolina, 283 U.S. 123 22

H. P. Hood & Sons, Inc. v. Du Mond, 336 U.S. 525 17-18

J. D. Adams Manufacturing Co. v. Storen, 304 U.S. 307 20

Louisville Gas & E. Co. v. Coleman, 277 U.S. 32 31

Michigan-Wisconsin Pipeline Co. v. Calvert, 347 U.S. 157 31

National Labor Relations Board v. Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation, 301 U.S. 1 ..... 10, 11-12

Northwestern States Portland Cement Co. v. Minnesota, 358 U.S. 450 ..... 2, 32

Ohio Oil Co. v. Conway, 281 U.S. 146 31

Utah Power & Light Co. v. Pfost, 286 U.S. 165 12

Weyerhaeuser Sales Co. v. Tax Commission, 30 Wn.2d 947, 192 P.2d 979; 34 Wn.2d 927, 209 P.2d 490, cert. den. 339 U.S. 903 28

Page

Wickard, et al. v. Filburn, 317 U.S. 111 (1942)..9, 10, 12-13

Williams v. Stockham Valves and Fittings, Inc., 358 U.S. 450..... 32

Wisconsin, et al. v. J. C. Penney Co., 311 U.S. 435....16, 22

STATUTES

Ala. Reg. 398.2..... 25

Ark. Laws of 1923, Art. 345..... 26

Ark. Stats. 1947, 84-2007..... 26

Code of West Virginia, Ch. 11, Art. 13, Sec. 2-b..... 25

D.C. Code, 1961, §47-1571a..... 25

R.C.W. Chap. 82.04, Title 82..... 4

R.C.W. 82.04.070 16

080 16

090 16

220 ..... 4, 25

240 ..... 4, 25, 27

270 ..... 4, 27

430 16

440 ..... 4, 27

R.C.W. 82.32.180 2

Reg. Kan. Tax Law, Art. 92-4-87..... 25

62 Stat. 929, 28 U.S.C. No. 1257(2)..... 2, 8

TEXTBOOKS

51 Am. Jur. §§150, 168, 178..... 31

I Schwartz, *A Commentary On the Constitution of the United States* (Macmillan, 1963)..... 13-14, 29-30

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

	Page
United States Constitution, Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 3	3, 4, 9, 30
14th Amendment	3, 4, 21, 30